

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ANDY OXENRIDER,

Plaintiff,

v.

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT
OF CORRECTIONS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 4:21-CV-01536

(Chief Judge Brann)

ORDER

JANUARY 7, 2022

AND NOW, upon consideration of Plaintiff’s second motion for appointment of counsel,¹ in which Plaintiff renews his request to be appointed counsel to assist him with his civil case but does not present any new or additional bases for appointment, and for the reasons contained in this Court’s denial of Plaintiff’s previous motion for appointment of counsel,² which the Court observes have not changed, and the Court further noting that if Plaintiff is “having trouble getting . . . the names of people involved”³ he can utilize “John Doe” or “Jane Doe” labels until he is able to obtain identification of the relevant defendant(s)

¹ Doc. 19.

² See Doc. 8.

³ Doc. 19 at 2.

through discovery,⁴ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's renewed motion (Doc. 19) for appointment of counsel is **DENIED**.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. Brann

Matthew W. Brann

Chief United States District Judge

⁴ The Court additionally notes that Plaintiff must first file a complaint that plausibly states a claim for relief before the Court will direct service on any named defendants.